

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/825,574 | 04/15/2004 | Kurt Brooks Uhlir | N0189US | 8870 | |
| 37583 NAVTEO NO | 7590 05/20/2010 RTH AMERICA, LLC | | EXAMINER | | |
| 425 West RAN | DOLPH STREET | HU, KANG | | | |
| CHICAGO, IL | PATENT DEPT . 60606 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| , | | | 3715 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 05/20/2010 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|----------|--------------|--|
| 10/825,574 | | UHLIR ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | KANG HU | 3715 | |

| | KANG HU | 3715 | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address | | | | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 03 May 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP | THE REPLY FILED 03 May 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | | |
| The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places t application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 4.1.31; or (3) a Reque for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: | | | | | | | | |
| The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing | date of the final rejection. | | | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.076 | date of the final rejection | n. | | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1,136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1,136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1,17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action, or (2) at set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filled, may reduce any aermed patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1,704(b). | | | | | | | | |
| NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). | | | | | | | | |
| <u>AMENDMENTS</u> | | | | | | | | |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for | | | | | | | | |
| appear; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. | | | | | | | | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | | | | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | mpliant Amendment (I | PTOL-324). | | | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | lowable if submitted in a separate, t | imely filed amendmer | t canceling the | | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: | ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will will will will will will will wi | be entered and an e | planation of | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 2-8,11-14,17-19,23 and 36-38. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 39. | | | | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | d sufficient reasons why the affidavi | t or other evidence is | necessary and | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se | and/or appellant fail: ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1 | s to provide a l. | | | | | |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | • | | | | | | |
| 11. \(\sum \) The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. | | | | | | | | |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. ☐ Other: | | | | | | | | |
| /XUAN M. THAI/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3715 | | | | | | | | |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant has filed amendment after final on 5/100. The amendment to claim 36 have been considered and are persuasive. The USC 101 rejection of claims 2-8, 11-14, 17-19 and 36 has been withdrawn. The amendment after final is entered.

The applicant further asserts that the combination of Muendel and Nimura falls to provide the teaching of comparison of different areas in differently located courses to have substantially equivalent surface, length, turns and etc. In response to applicant's assertion, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Keller, 642 F.24 413, 208 USFQ 871 (CCPA 1981). In this particular case, the combination of prior arts provides the limitation has recited in claims 36-38, where Muendel provides comparison of different geographic areas, and Nimura provides different attributes that can be utilized by Muendel. Even though Muendel does not explicitly recite comparing two different geographic locales based on the number of different attributes provided in the limitation, havever one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have combined the teachings of Muendel and Nimura to provide the limitation, however one of ordinary skill in the past of the invention would have combined the teachings of Muendel and Nimura to provide the limitation, have provided and the provides of the invention would have combined the teachings of Muendel and Nimura to provide the limitation and explanation of combination of prior arts have been discussed in detail in the final relaction mailed on 3/2/2010 and not repeated herein.

The applicant further amended claim 37 to recite similar limitations from claim 38, additionally assenting that the combination does not provide presenting to the participant is engaged in the performance. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Muendel provides different models of comparison as the applicant particularly pointed out in, specifically directing to Muendel, page 28, lines 14-20. However Muendel provides more than just a single means of comparison. Muendel additionally provides different modes of comparison in a real time basis in a virtual competition such as a race (Muendel, page 10, lines 1-25). Other examples of real time virtual training can be found throughout the prior art.